

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11

12 PNY TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

13
14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 SANDISK CORPORATION,

17
18 Defendant.
19

Case No.: C-11-04689 WHO (JSC)

**AMENDED ORDER RE:
DISCOVERY DISPUTE (Dkt. Nos. 135
& 136)**

20 In this antitrust case, the parties have each submitted a letter asking the Court to resolve
21 discovery disputes that remain following multiple meet-and-confer sessions. (Dkt. Nos. 135, 136.)
22 Specifically, the parties jointly ask the Court to resolve the following two disputes: 1) whether
23 Defendant SanDisk Corp. (“SanDisk”) shall run the vertically-integrated, customer, and competitor
24 search strings against all 22 custodians identified by Plaintiff PNY Technologies, Inc. (“PNY”), or
25 simply the 10 custodians that the parties have previously agreed to; and 2) whether SanDisk shall run
26 the customer and competitor search strings against all the competitor entities identified by PNY.
27 After carefully considering the parties’ briefing, and having had the benefit of oral argument on
28 August 15, 2013, the Court rules as set forth below.

1 For the reasons stated at the hearing, the Court concludes that SanDisk shall run the to-be-
2 agreed-upon search terms against four additional custodians, per the parties' undisputed, original
3 agreement. The Court denies without prejudice PNY's request to compel the search of all the
4 custodians PNY has identified.

5 In addition, SanDisk shall run the to-be-agreed-upon search terms against those competitors
6 who entered into the licensing agreements directly at issue in this case, as well as those competitors
7 who SanDisk has sued in patent enforcement actions. The Court denies without prejudice PNY's
8 request to compel the search of all the competitor entities it has identified.

9 Finally, the Court orders that the parties shall attend by phone or in person weekly status
10 conferences on the parties' discovery process. These status conferences shall occur every Thursday
11 at 9:00 a.m. unless the parties, with the Court's concurrence, agree otherwise. In light of this
12 procedure, the Court denies the parties' remaining requests, including setting production deadlines
13 and conditions on document requests and productions.

14 This Order disposes of Dkt. Nos. 135 and 136.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17
18 Dated: August 19, 2013

19 
20 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28